1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,

Plaintiff,

٧.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT et. al.,

Defendants.

Case Nos. 23-cv-3911-PJH 23-cv-3971-PJH 23-cv-4160-PJH 23-cv-4163-PJH 23-cv-4165-PJH 23-cv-4169-PJH 23-cv-4170-PJH

## ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE CASES WITH PREJUDICE

23-cv-4172-PJH

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas petition in this court with appointed counsel. *See Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. *See In re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as defendants various state courts and municipalities. He seeks relief regarding his underlying conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and federal courts.

To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases, he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is "under imminent danger of serious physical injury" at the time he filed his complaint. 28 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case No. 13-0951 CW.

## Case 4:23-cv-03971-PJH Document 2 Filed 08/28/23 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court	Northern District of California
------------------------------	---------------------------------

The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent
danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an
IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under <i>Heck v. Humphrey</i> , 512
U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), Demos v. U.S.
District Court, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court,
828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with
prejudice.

The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 28, 2023

/s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON United States District Judge